

CH



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/893,555	06/29/2001	Hong Jin Kim	8733.443.00	5076

30827 7590 08/26/2003

MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K STREET, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20006

EXAMINER

NGO, HUYEN LE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2871

DATE MAILED: 08/26/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Applicati n N .

09/893,555

Applicant(s)

KIM, HONG JIN

Examiner

Julie-Huyen L. Ngo

Art Unit

2871

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the c rrespondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-41 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 5-41 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION***Election/Restrictions***

In Paper No. 8, Applicants have elected without traverse of Species A, which read on claims 1, 3-6 and 13-15 and Figures 4A-B and 9A-B.

However, amended claims 5 and 6 are directed to a non-elected Species C, which read on Figure 6A-B with "*the width of the electrode pad increases with its length*".

Furthermore, amended claims 13-15 are directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the originally presented invention because of the limitations amended in the claims as follow:

In claim 13, "*the electrode links are different from each other in a thickness,*"

In claim 14, "*the width of the electrode pad increases with its length*".

In claim 15, "*the width of the electrode pad decreases with its length*".

Since applicant has received an action on the merits for the originally presented invention, this invention has been constructively elected by original presentation for prosecution on the merits. Accordingly, claims 5-6 and 13-15 withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship

Art Unit: 2871

must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kishimoto et al. (US4586789).

Kishimoto et al. teach (Figs. 4 and 7) forming a liquid crystal display including a pixel area and a driving circuit comprising:

- at least two electrode links 15, each extended from the pixel area;
- at least two pad members in contact with the driving circuit and the electrode links,
- each pad members having a different size in accordance with a length of the electrode link. As shown in Fig. 4, pad members 13 and 14 have different size in accordance with a length of the electrode link 15. As shown in Fig. 7, pad members 22 and 23 have different size in accordance with a length of the electrode link.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kishimoto et al. (US4586789) in view of conventional art admitted by applicant (Figs.1-3).

Kishimoto et al. teach (Figs. 4 and 7) forming a liquid crystal display including a pixel area and a driving circuit comprising:

As to claim 1:

- at least two electrode links 15, each extended from the pixel area;
- at least two pad members 13 and 14 in contact with the driving circuit and the electrode links 15,
- each pad members having a different size in accordance with a length of the electrode link.

wherein

- the electrode pad varies along with the length of the electrode link in at least one of a width, a length and a thickness (claim 3).

Art Unit: 2871

- the electrode pad is extended toward the pixel area to have a different length in accordance with the length of the electrode link (claim 4).

However, Kishimoto et al. fail to teach a liquid crystal display with each pad member including:

- an electrode pad connected to the electrode link; and
- a transparent electrode in contact with the driving circuit and the electrode pad,

wherein any one of the electrode pad and the transparent electrode varies along with the length of the electrode links as recited in claim 2.

Applicant admits (Figs. 2-3 and page 4, lines 17-18) that a conventional display comprises:

- a pad member including an electrode pad connected to the electrode link;
- a transparent electrode 18 in contact with the driving circuit and the electrode pad,

wherein any one of the electrode pad and the transparent electrode varies along with the length of the electrode links for electrically contacting with the TCP having the driving circuit via a contact portion.

Art Unit: 2871

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify a liquid crystal display as Kishimoto et al. disclosed with:

- each pad member including an electrode pad connected to the electrode link;
- a transparent electrode in contact with the driving circuit and the electrode pad,

wherein any one of the electrode pad and the transparent electrode varies along with the length of the electrode links for electrically contacting with the TCP having the driving circuit via a contact portion.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed on August 7, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant's ONLY arguments are following:

1) Kishimoto et al. fail to disclose "*each pad members having a different size in accordance with a length of the electrode link.*"

2) NA does not disclose or suggest "*the electrode links are different from each other in a thickness*".

Examiner's responses to Applicants' ONLY arguments are following:

1) Kishimoto et al. disclose in Fig. 4 that "each pad members having a different size in accordance with a length of the electrode link" with pad member 13 is longer than pad member 14.

Art Unit: 2871

2) In response to applicant's argument that the NA reference fails to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the feature upon which applicant relies, i.e., *"the electrode links are different from each other in a thickness"*, is not recited in the rejected claims. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Contact Information

Art Unit: 2871

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Julie-Huyen L. Ngo whose telephone number is (703) 305-3508. The Examiner can normally be reached on T-Friday.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's Supervisor, Mr. Robert H. Kim can be reached at (703) 305-3492.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

August 19, 2003

Julie-Huyen L. Ngo
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2871